



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

You have alluded to the ceremonies attending the inauguration of the Pope, in order to show that care is taken to keep up in reality the claim, which in words has been withdrawn. This custom or ceremony is thought objectionable by many Catholics.—*Vide* Eustace's Classical Tour.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ENQUIRER.

August 6, 1854.

The writer of the above letter has mistaken the gloss in which the celebrated words in question are found; and, consequently, all that he says about Constantine is irrelevant to the subject. That the word "*Deus*," in the sense of the Hebrew term "*Elohim*" (God), is applied to Moses and the Judges of Israel, is evident from the fact that, had this been its intended sense, it would have been sufficient to have said so, instead of stealthily withdrawing the word altogether.

Our correspondent exclaims, "How very prudent, and how very convenient it is to seize hold of an expression, used hundreds of years ago, [and] denied, according to your own showing, in the seventeenth century!" We answer, that we deem it both prudent and convenient to point out to our Roman Catholic readers the means by which the dogma of Papal infallibility was established in the middle ages. We think it judicious and useful to direct attention to the scaffolding, so to speak, by which the edifice of the Divine supremacy of the Pope was erected, though the wise builders removed it as soon as the structure was complete. Nor is it unimportant to observe, as we have done, that in the case before us, the removal was one of the fruits of the Reformation. Were it not for the indignant remonstrance of the Reformers, jealous for the honour of God, the portentous words, "Our Lord God the Pope," would, doubtless, have remained to the present day on record, a reproach and a disgrace to Christianity.

As to the title "*Servus Servorum Dei*" (servant of the servants of God), which the Pope assumes, we should be very happy, and universal Christendom would have reason to rejoice, were the humility denoted by it a characteristic of the Papacy. But we cannot forget that it was borne by some of the haughtiest as well as the worst of men—by a Hildebrand, a Boniface VIII., and an Alexander VI.

We are truly glad that many Roman Catholics object to the ceremonies which accompany the inauguration of the Pope. Still they exist; and their existence is a proof, as we have said, that, in the practice of the Church of Rome, the principle embodied in the words "Our Lord God the Pope," is still affirmed, though the words themselves are, for prudential reasons, repudiated.

ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—In your leading article for this month, you go to prove your right to the term Catholic, and very generously concede it to other Churches; and you quote Athanasius, in your defence—"This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity"—a portion of his creed against the Arians, showing the Catholic sense, and belief thereof, omitting essential articles of faith that Protestant and Catholic hold in common. The Greek and Protestant Churches, &c., would, in truth, be branches of the true Church, if they were only separated by distance, and not in belief. It does not require much argument to prove, that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous—and, God knows, they are almost numberless—have no right whatever to the title; if, as I remarked above, they all believed the one and same dogmas, ceremonies, internal and outward essentials of the true Church, they would, then, be one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; but when they differ so widely from the parent Church, and wrangle so bitterly with each other, believing and teaching, at least, that their form, mode or conventicle, is just the thing to be saved by—the true, apostolic way—and all others, be what they may, are more or less astray from the one true path, that leads to heaven direct—comparing the Catholic Church to a tree and its branches, as a natural consequence, the branches must, and are all alike in appearance, in substance, and sap; its seedlings identical, its natural offspring essentially the same in all its propagating propensities; what more unnatural, than to see the olive tree bearing the prickly pear, the cocoa tree the rose of Sharon? "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church"—the apostolic sense is this, I believe it to be Holy, I believe it to be Universal; that it is the Church, fitted and appointed for all generations, for all ages, climes, and people; and that none other Church, be its pretensions what they may, is the Church of God; that communion with it is periling the salvation of whatever souls are subject to her teaching.

You claim not infallibility for your Church, therefore, you deny it to all Churches. You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to all Churches, conventicles, and meetings, that prayer is their professed object. What have you gained by this? Are the numberless Churches universal in time, place, and doctrine? Were the Apostles to preach on earth again, would they recognise Catholicity in those religious denominations? Who will answer me Yes? You believe, as Catholics do,

that bishops are of divine origin. The Scots Church believes them useless, an encumbrance, yea, unholy things. What think you of this? Are they Apostolic thus far? Are they Catholic for all this? And the numerous good citizens of the world, who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic in the true Apostolic sense? It would take more space than you could admit of to enumerate the particulars and inconsistencies of the numberless Churches that claim Catholicity for their mark; and each and all would deem themselves deeply insulted were you to question their right to said mark—*Catholic*.

I am, dear sir,
Yours respectfully,
A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Carlow, July 23, 1854.

There are some Protestants who think that all Roman Catholics hold precisely the same set of religious opinions, and treat them accordingly; and many Roman Catholics return the compliment by imagining a set of opinions which they suppose all Protestants must hold.

Both parties are wrong; for Roman Catholics differ as widely (if not more widely), among themselves, about religious opinions, as Protestants do; and few, or none, can be found among Protestants who really hold the opinions which Roman Catholics often attribute to all Protestants. Our correspondent falls into this mistake; he has in his own head a certain set of notions, which he considers "Protestant;" and then he feels quite sure that we must hold these notions, and that we must have written them too, although we defy him to find them in our paper.

What else can we say of a correspondent who writes to us thus:—"You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to all Churches, conventicles, and meetings."

And the numerous good citizens of the world who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic? We certainly have never said anything of the kind: and we have said before now that we regard baptism as the only entrance into Christ's visible Church on earth; and we certainly have never extended the term "Catholic" beyond the members of that Church.

We think it must be evident to any one who reads the article to which our correspondent refers, that we were then considering "Catholicity" only as it refers to faith. Churches which hold the Catholic creeds unchanged, as their articles of faith—those we consider Catholic in respect of faith; this was our assertion in that article, as well as in others; and to this judgment we adhere.

Where the question of Catholicity in conduct and action comes in, we do not scruple to declare our judgment, that those who cause divisions and separations in the body of Christ, are so far offenders against Catholic communion. But here we insist that facts are to be examined, and offences and divisions laid to the account of those who are truly and really guilty of them. And when this is done, we find that the Church of Rome is more guilty of offences against Catholic communion, than any other section of professing Christians in the world.

Take the case of the Lutherans, whom we mentioned in our article. The Lutherans never went out of the Church, or separated from it, by any act of their own. All they asked was to remain in communion with the whole Church—with the Church at Rome—with the Pope himself—on these terms—viz., holding the ancient Catholic creeds as the only true and complete summary of the Catholic faith; and doing nothing in the service or worship of the Church contrary to the word of God. Rome answered them by adding twelve new articles to the ancient creeds, and REFUSING TO HOLD COMMUNION with any who would not profess those new articles as part of the ANCIENT CATHOLIC FAITH. Was it not Rome that was really guilty of breaking Catholic communion? The Apostles not only directed that unity should be preserved, but they settled the terms of communion; and the ancient Church embodied and preserved those terms in the Catholic creeds. The Lutherans asked nothing, but that communion should be preserved on those apostolic terms. Rome altered the terms, and refused to communicate on the terms of the ancient Catholic creeds. And now, forsooth, on account of this, the Romanists only are Catholics, and the Lutherans are not Catholics!

It is no part of our business to prove that the Lutherans were right in everything. In the matter of the Lord's Supper, and in the matter of images, they did not sufficiently throw off all Romish errors. In some of the constitutions of an apostolic Church, they were defective; but that was not by their own choice, but by the conduct of the German bishops. And we believe that God will visit all offences on the guilty, and not on the innocent.

It is no part of our business to deny that some Protestant sects, who are Catholic in respect of their faith, have committed offences against Catholic unity; just as the Church of Rome has done, though, perhaps, seldom to the same extent. We do not justify such things. We do not wish our readers to be partakers of offences, by whomsoever committed. We show our readers a Church—the ancient Catholic Church of this country—a Church which makes no terms of communion but the ancient Catholic creeds—a

* We beg our Roman Catholic readers to try and understand what we mean by "Protestant," we do not mean simply all who reject the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome; Mahometans believe that the religion of Rome is false and idolatrous, yet we do not count them Protestants, because they do not hold the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith; we say just the same of Socinians.

Church which does not owe its existence to any act of separation—which has never committed any act of schism—and we say this is the Church to which Christians, in this country, ought to belong. Let our correspondent, if he can, bring forward a definite charge of schism against this United Church of England and Ireland, showing what specific acts of schism she has committed, and when and where those acts were committed—and we are ready to answer him. But, if he can say only that some other Protestant bodies have offended against Catholic unity, we answer that such a fact has nothing at all to do with the course which we recommend to the Irish people; and, therefore, it is foreign to the purpose of our journal to discuss it.

Our correspondent repeats the old argument, so often answered, "it does not require much argument to prove that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous, have no right whatever to the title."

Now, the word "Catholic" simply means "universal." Let us, therefore, put the word "universal" in place of "Catholic," in that sentence of his, and see what evident nonsense it becomes. "It does not require much argument to prove that one Church only can be universal, all others, however numerous, can have no right whatever to the title!"

In St. Paul's days, there was a Church of Rome, a Church of Corinth, a Church of Galatia, a Church of Jerusalem, &c., &c.; which one was then universal? Was not each one "universal" or "Catholic," as a part of the whole—none universal by itself alone? And how can it be otherwise now? No Church is now universal by itself alone. Each Church, so far as it holds the Catholic creeds, and adheres to the apostolic terms of communion, is "Catholic" or "universal," as being a part of the whole; and, in this sense, which is the true sense, Rome (which had added to the Catholic creeds, and refused to communicate with others on the terms settled by the Apostles) has, perhaps, the weakest title of all to the name of "Catholic."

INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—Will you kindly insert the following questions:—

1st—If the Church is infallible, how is it that St. Paul says, there should be an apostasy, a falling away from the true faith? such a thing, I imagine, could not occur if the Church had the promise of infallibility.

2nd—Why did St. Paul, in his epistle to the ancient Church of Rome, charge them not to be high-minded but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches take heed lest he also spare not thee. Now, I think St. Paul must have thought very little of infallibility when he said that.

3rd—In the Apocalypse we find our Lord reproving, exhorting, and comforting the Seven Churches of Asia, as each required; the Church of Laodicea, especially, he rebukes very sharply, he brings against it the charge of unfaithfulness; now, surely, that Church was a partaker of the promise of the Holy Spirit "that He should guide it into all truth," as well as any other, and yet it was not infallible, it wanted life; and the Church of Sardis, also, "had a name that it liveth," and our Lord says it was dead. It is plain enough then, I think, that these two Churches were not infallible. With these instances, therefore, I think we may conclude, that no Church is infallible.

If there was no danger, why did St. Paul warn the Romans against "high-mindedness?"

If some of your Roman Catholic correspondents will kindly answer the above questions and satisfy me, they will greatly oblige

Your obedient servant,
W. R.

FLOWERS FOR AUGUST.

IF August be less prolific than the preceding month in its flowers, it is more abundant in its fruits; and the rich corn waving over the fields imparts a substantial beauty to the land, which many will regard more than the most glorious display of flowers. Along the roadsides we find in full flower the BRAMBLE (*Rubus suberectus*). Its two principal varieties are the Raspberry and the Blackberry. The raspberry (*Rubus idaeus*)—so called from the rasp or roughness of its fruit—is found wild in the woods of Ireland. Its delicious fruit is too well known to need further notice. The Blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus*) displays its erect flowers and petals of delicate pale pink, on its long, flexible sprays in our hedges and thickets; its fruit, when ripe, is both wholesome and agreeable. Who has not gathered blackberries in the days of childhood, or even of mature age, and enjoyed the feast, which nature's bounty afforded without culture or care, with as much pleasure as the rarest fruits the garden or hothouse could give? The Bramble is the subject of the oldest apologue or fable extant, called Jothan's (or Joathan's) parable, and narrated in the Book of Judges, ix., v. 8 to 15.

Another humble, but sweet flower of the riverside and summer stream, to which we are much attached, is the MEADOW-SWEET (*Spiraea ulmaria*). Its flowers of yellowish-white or cream-colour, are to be gathered almost in the water itself, whence it peers out like a piece of lace-work embroidery, so soft that even the rude winds seem loth to disturb it, except to waft its sweet perfume over